## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE/Passage

SUBJECT: Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1854. Agreeing to the conference report.

## **ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 94-4**

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1995, will appropriate \$2.18 billion, which is \$206 million (8.4 percent) less than was appropriated in fiscal year (FY) 1995, and which is 16 percent less than the President's request. Details include the following:

- \$426.9 million for Senate operations (a 7 percent decrease); committee funding will be reduced by 15 percent; the mail account will be frozen at \$11 million; funding for the Sergeant at Arms and the Secretary of the Senate will each be reduced by 12.5 percent;
  - \$671.6 million for House operations (a 7 percent increase);
- \$143 million for the Architect of the Capitol, excluding library/grounds (a 10 percent decrease); the Architect's budget request will be reduced because its accounting practices obscure both the true amount and actual purpose of some spending requests;
  - \$12.4 million for the Architect of the Capitol, library/grounds (a 1 percent decrease);
  - \$60.1 million for the Congressional Research Service (CRS; equal to last year's appropriations);
  - \$264.6 million for the Library of Congress (excluding CRS; a 1 percent increase);
  - \$374.4 million for the General Accounting Office (a 15 percent decrease; an additional 10 percent cut is planned for FY 1997);
  - \$83.8 million for the Government Printing Office's (GPO's) congressional operations (a 5 percent decrease);
  - \$30.3 million for other GPO operations (a 6 percent decrease);
  - \$24.3 million for the Congressional Budget Office;
- \$3.6 million for the Office of Technology Assessment (an 84 percent decrease; funds are for termination costs; see vote No. 316 for related debate); and
  - \$3.1 million for the Botanical Gardens (a 3 percent decrease).

(See other side)

YEAS (94)				NAYS (4)		NOT VOTING (2)	
		Den	emocrats	Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats
		(42 or 93%)		(1 or 2%)	(3 or 7%)	(1)	(1)
Abraham Ashcroft Bennett Bond Burns Campbell Chafee Coats Cochran Cohen Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Dole Domenici Faircloth Frist Gorton Grams Grassley Gregg Hatch Hatfield Helms Hutchison	Inhofe Jeffords Kassebaum Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Packwood Pressler Roth Santorum Shelby Simpson Smith Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Akaka Biden Bingaman Boxer Bradley Breaux Bryan Bumpers Byrd Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Exon Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Graham Harkin Inouye	Johnston Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Nunn Pell Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Simon Wellstone	Brown	Baucus Heflin Hollings	EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other  SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	nced Yea nced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 461 SEPTEMBER 22, 1995

## Those favoring passage contended:

To balance the budget deep spending cuts must be made. Members could duck responsibility for deciding which accounts to cut the most simply by making across-the-board cuts, but doing so would be irresponsible. We need to prioritize spending, and make deeper reductions in areas of lesser priority. The conference report before us takes that approach. It moves line by line through the legislative branch budget to reduce legislative branch operations by almost 9 percent. The cutting will not end here; further cuts are already planned for next year. The conference report will totally eliminate the Office of Technology Assessment, will cut the General Accounting Office by 25 percent over 2 years, will cut committee staffs by 15 percent, and will cut the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate, and others 12.5 percent. We cannot ask Americans to take cuts in spending on them if we are not first willing to cut spending on ourselves. This bill cuts spending on Congress, it cuts it significantly, and it cuts it rationally. We are pleased to vote in favor of this conference report.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to passage.